

REMARKS

The applicants have carefully considered the Office action dated April 29, 2008, and the reference cited therein. By way of the forgoing amendments, claim 1, 5, 14, and 18 have been amended. In view of the forgoing amendments and following remarks, it is submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 was rejected as anticipated by Bobo II et al. (6,564,321) ("Bobo"). Claim 1, as amended, recites a method comprising, *inter alia*, identifying one of the first database or the second database in which a second XML-based communication message is stored; based on the identification, converting the first XML-based communication message into a converted message having a format associated with the identified one of the first or second database that stores the second XML-based communication message; and based on the identification, causing the converted message to be stored in association with the second XML-based communication message in the identified one of the first or second database that stores the second XML-based communication message. It is respectfully submitted that Bobo is missing at least the foregoing recitations.

For example, Bobo does not teach or suggest identifying a database in which an identified second communication is stored and, based on the identification, converting and storing the message. Rather, as cited in the Office action on Page 4, lines 19-22, Bobo describes automatically converting messages to a standard format, without regard to the database into which the message will be stored. The conversion in Bobo is not conditional whatsoever. In other words, Bobo does not convert the messages based on an identified database. Further, while Bobo describes storing a message in a database (Abstract), Bobo does not suggest that such storage is based on identification of a database.

As another example, Bobo does not teach or suggest identifying one of a first database or a second database in which a second message is stored. While Bobo suggests

that messages associated with a user may be stored in a single directory, Bobo does not teach or suggest any method or need for identifying one of a first or second database. It is respectfully submitted that Bobo would have no need for such a procedure because Bobo describes the use of an HTML file that includes identifying information for stored messages: “The HTML file "voicelist.html" which contains a list of all voice messages would then have an anchor to the filename "1.wav" along with identifying information for the voice message, such as when the message was received.” (Col. 14, lines 18-22).

Accordingly, Bobo fails to teach or suggest all elements of claim 1, and, in particular, at least each of those elements explained above. It is respectfully submitted that for any one or more of the reasons provided above, claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom are in condition for allowance.

It is respectfully submitted that for at least the reasons provided in accordance with claim 1, claim 14 and all claims depending therefrom are in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner is of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number identified below.

Hanley, Flight & Zimmerman, LLC
(at customer number **83417**)
150 S. Wacker Dr.
Suite 2100
Chicago, Illinois 60606
312.580.1020

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael W. Zimmerman/
Michael W. Zimmerman

Reg. No. 57,993
Attorney for Applicant

Dated: February 17, 2009